1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332) United States Attorney					
2						
3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division					
4	RICHARD C. CHENG (CSBN 135992) Assistant U. S. Attorney					
5	·					
6	150 Almaden Boulevard, 9 th Floor San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5032					
7	Fax: (408) 535-5066 e-mail: richard.cheng@usdoj.gov					
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
9	Autorneys for Flament					
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION					
13	LINUTED STATES OF AMERICA.					
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Criminal Case No. CR 09-00719-MHP					
15	Plaintiff,) STIPULATION OF PARTIES					
16) FOR CONTINUANCE OF v.) STATUS HEARING					
17) AND [<u>PROPOSED]</u> ORDER GREGORY ALEXANDER,					
18) San Francisco Venue Defendant.					
19						
20	With the agreement of the parties, and with the consent of the defendant Gregory					
21	Alexander, the Court enters this order (1) vacating the first motion hearing for the defendant					
22	Gregory Alexander, currently set for April 21, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.; and (2) setting a new motion					
23	hearing for the defendant Gregory Alexander for June 18, 2010 at 10:00 a.m The parties agree,					
24	and the Court finds and holds, as follows:					
25	1. The defendant Gregory Alexander was indicted for multiple counts of unauthorized					
26	access of a protected computer and aggravated identity theft on July 15, 2009.					
27	Mr. Alexander was represented by retained counsel Seth Chazin, and entered not					
28	guilty pleas before Magistrate Trumbull in San Jose, California on July 17, 2009.					

1		On that same day, Mr. Alexander was released on a personal appearance bond of
2		\$100,000 secured by the signatures of two financially responsible adults. He was
3		thereafter instructed to appear before Judge Whyte in San Jose on August 24, 2009
4		at 9:00 a.m. for a status hearing.
5	2.	On July 28, 2009, Magistrate Trumbull issued an order appointing the Federal
6		Public Defender to represent Mr. Alexander. AFPD Lara Vinnard was assigned to
7		represent Mr. Alexander.,
8	3.	On July 31, 2009, a Notice of Related Case was filed by AFPD Vinnard, relating
9		the instant criminal case to an on-going civil matter CV-08-05126-MHP. The
10		United States did not oppose the request to relate the criminal matter.
11	4.	On August 11, 2009, this Court issued an order relating the criminal case. On that
12		same date a notice of substitution of counsel was filed designating AFPD Elizabeth
13		Falk as assigned counsel to Mr. Alexander.
14	5.	On August 11, 2009, pursuant to the Order Relating Case, Judge Whyte and Judge
15		Magistrate Seeborg was no longer assigned to the criminal matter and all dates
16		were previously set were ordered vacated.
17	6.	On January 25, 2010, this Court issued an order at the request of the defense and
18		with the agreement of the United States, amending the briefing schedule for pre-
19		trial motions, to include a motions due date of March 1, 2010.
20	7.	The defense thereafter filed three separate pre-trial motions, to include a motion for
21		a Bill of Particulars filed on March 1, 2010, and Motion for Discovery of All
22		Communications between the Government and Subpoenaed Parties; and Motion for
23		Dismissal of Aggravated Identity Theft Charge, both filed on March 2, 2010.
24	8.	In light of the fact the factual inquiries and allegations contained in the defendant's
25		moving papers, it has been necessary to enlist the assistance and expertise of the
26		investigating agent Kyle Haynes, United States Secret Service. Agent Haynes
27		however has been difficult to impossible to reach, having been consistently
28		assigned to a number of protection assignments to include the King of Jordan,

1		protective duties of a numb	per of heads of state at the Conference of Nuclear
2		Nations in Washington, D.C	C., and a extended detail to the United States Secret
3		Service offices in the Unite	d Kingdom. I have received a e-mail from Agent
4		Haynes, who indicates that h	e will be returning to from London on June 14, 2010.
5		Because Agent Haynes is	a necessary witness to the pre-trial motions, the
6		Government has requested th	e motion hearing date be continued to a date available
7		to both to the defendant, defe	ense counsel and to the Court.
8	9.	Further, pursuant to the requ	uest of the defense counsel, counsel for the United
9		States will file an signed de	eclaration from Agent Haynes regarding the factual
10		inquires made within the def	endant's moving papers.
11	10.	The parties, including defend	lant Gregory Alexander agree to a waiver of time for
12		the purposes of the Speedy	Trial Act and agree that the period of time between
13		April 21, 2010 through June	e 18, 2010 may be excluded in light of the need for
14		additional time for continuity	y of counsel and adequate defense preparation.
15			
16	SO STIPULA	ATED.	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney
17			Cinica States Attorney
18	DATED:		RICHARD C. CHENG
19			Assistant U.S. Attorney
20	DATED:		
21	<i>DITTED</i> :		ELIZABETH FALK Assistant Federal Public Defender
22			Attorney for Defendant
23			
24			
25			
25 26			

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	LIMITED ST	ATEC DICTRICT COLIDT	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	NORTHERN D	ISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Criminal Case No. CR 09-00719-MHP	
14	Plaintiff,)))	
15) [PROPOSED] ORDER)	
16	v.)	
	GREGORY ALEXANDER,)	
17 18	Defendant.))	
19	For the reasons stated in the parties	/ Stipulation To Continue Sentencing, and for good cause	

For the reasons stated in the parties Stipulation To Continue Sentencing, and for good cause shown, the Court vacates the April 21, 2010 motions hearing date with respect to the defendant Gregory Alexander, and sets a new pre-trial motions hearing date of June 18, 2010, at 10:00 a.m.

Further, based upon the representation of counsel and for good cause shown, the Court finds that failing to exclude the time between April 21, 2010 and June 18, 2010 would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel and would deny counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The Court further finds that the ends of justice served by excluding the time between April 21, 2010 and June 18, 2010 from computation under the Speedy Trial Act outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the time between April 21, 2010 and June 18, 2010 shall be excluded from computation under the Speedy Trial Act. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv). IT IS SO ORDERED DATED: <u>4/22/2010</u> Judge Marilyn H. Patel DISTRICT